

**UNPUBLISHED**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Plaintiff-Appellee.

v.

No. 00-4093

ROBERT O'DELL EDWARDS, II, a/k/a  
Robert O'Dell Edwards,  
Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh.  
W. Earl Britt, Senior District Judge.  
(CR-98-203)

Submitted: July 14, 2000

Decided: July 27, 2000

Before LUTTIG and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges, and  
HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

**COUNSEL**

Thomas P. McNamara, Federal Public Defender, Stephen C. Gordon,  
Assistant Federal Public Defender, Raleigh, North Carolina, for  
Appellant. Janice McKenzie Cole, United States Attorney, Anne M.  
Hayes, Assistant United States Attorney, Felice McConnell Corpen-  
ing, Assistant United States Attorney, Raleigh, North Carolina, for  
Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

---

## OPINION

### PER CURIAM:

Robert O'Dell Edwards appeals the twenty-month prison sentence the district court imposed after revoking his supervised release. Edwards asserts that the sentence was plainly unreasonable because it exceeded the four-to-ten-month sentence suggested under U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 7B1.4(a), p.s. (1998). Edwards also claims that the court failed to consider the factors in 18 U.S.C.A. § 3553(a) (West 1985 & Supp. 2000), before imposing sentence. We affirm.

After a thorough review of the record--including the nature and extent of Edwards' supervised release violations, the probation officer's amended motion for revocation, the worksheet notifying the district court of the revocation range recommended in Chapter 7 of the sentencing guidelines, and the arguments presented before the district court--we reject Edwards' arguments and conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in sentencing him to a twenty-month term of imprisonment. See United States v. Davis, 53 F.3d 638, 642 (4th Cir. 1995) (providing standard of review). We also find that the district court properly considered the factors set forth in § 3553(a). See id. ("A court need not engage in ritualistic incantation in order to establish its consideration of a legal issue. It is sufficient if . . . the district court rules on issues that have been fully presented for determination. Consideration is implicit in the court's ultimate ruling.").

Accordingly, we affirm Edwards' sentence. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

### AFFIRMED